

Appl. No. 09/513,962
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 14 September 2004

Page 7 of 8

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 2-12 and 14-20 are pending in the application.

The Office action rejects:

claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Abramson (USP 6,151,313); and
claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Abramson and Secord et al. (USP
6,373,831, hereinafter Secord).

The applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 11, upon which claim 12 depends, is amended to claim a communications system comprising a plurality of transmitters that are configured to communicate messages to a receiver, wherein each message has an associated code-phase, is independent of each other message, and does not include a substantial sequence of bits that are common among each of the other messages. As taught by the applicants, the applicants' system discriminates messages from multiple transmitters based on an energy content of bit-length segments of the messages at different code-phases.

Abramson, on the other hand, teaches that each message includes a known synchronization sequence that is common among all of the messages from the multiple transmitters, and estimates (equations 22-23) the code-phase of each message based on the start of each message, by recognizing (equation 21) the start of each known synchronization sequence (Abramson, column 4, line 48 through column 5, line 24). Of particular note, Abramson states: "Since the packet synchronization sequence is known" at column 4, line 64, as the premise for the application of equations 21-23.

Because the applicants teach a discrimination of messages based on an energy content of bit-length sequences at different code-phases, rather than an estimation of the code phase of each message and a discrimination based on the estimate, the applicants are able to use a transmission scenario wherein each message does not include a substantial sequence of bits that are common among each of the other messages, as specifically claimed in claim 11.

Because Abramson does not teach or suggest a communication system wherein each message does not include a substantial sequence of bits that are common among each of the other messages, and because Abramson specifically teaches a communication system wherein

Appl. No. 09/513,962
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 14 September 2004

Page 8 of 8

each message includes a synchronization sequence of bits that are common among each of the other messages, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Abramson and claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Abramson and Secord.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. McDermott, Attorney
Registration Number 41,508
patents@lawyer.com

1824 Federal Farm Road
Montross, VA 22520
Phone: 804-493-0707
Fax: 215-243-7525